	1
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3 4	DOMINICA MANAGEMENT INC,
5 6 7 8 9	Plaintiff DOCKET NO.: CV-04-7675 -vs- New York, New York December 22, 2004 AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ANTIGUA, et al.,
11 12	Defendants
13	TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR CONFERENCE
14 15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANK MAAS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16	APPEARANCES:
17 18 19 20	For the Plaintiff: PETER J. MASTAGLIO, ESQ. Cullen & Dykman LLP 100 Quentin Roosevelt Boulevard Garden City, NY 11530
21 22 23 24	For the Defendant: LEONARD SCLAFANI, ESQ. Polatsek & Sclafani 275 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016
25	Audio Operator: No Audio Operator
26 27	Proceedings Recorded by Electronic Sound Recording Transcript Produced by Transcription Service
28 29 30 31 32	KRISTIN M RUSIN 5686 Sullivan Trail Nazareth, PA 18064 kmrusin@earthlink.net

```
1
         (Beginning portion of proceeding not recorded.)
              MR. SCLAFANI: -- shortly after that transfer --
 2
 3
              THE COURT: The Devry that I see on matchbook covers
 4
              MR. SCLAFANI: Yes, Judge.
 5
 6
              THE COURT: -- and subway ads?
 7
              MR. SCLAFANI: Right, who is really the -- or should
   be the plaintiff in this lawsuit. They own DMI.
 8
                                                      They own Ross
   University as well.
 9
              My understanding -- and I could be wrong; I don't
10
11
   know which of the two entities, Leeds or D.M. -- or -- or --
   Devry -- but one or the other of them, long after I was gone,
   reorganized Ross University and DMI so that Ross University --
13
14
   or DMI became owned by Ross University or some -- according to
   my adversary, they're affiliated or they're -- they're
15
   subsidiaries of some sort, so there must be now ownership.
16
17
              In the letter that he writes, I get the impression
   that to me -- I get the impression that Ross University now
18
   wholly owns DMI, but that wasn't the case during my
19
20
   representation.
21
             The claims in this lawsuit involve a computer program
   that wasn't in existence at the time that I was there. And in
22
23
   any event, I had no dealings whatsoever with Ross University's
   computer program, not even in what I would typically be
25 | involved in, which was the litigation over payment when Ross
```

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

University failed to make it, or -- or warranties, or the like. That was basically the nature of my litigation.

I wasn't setting company policy. I wasn't involved in the academic aspects of the university much. Every once in a while, we had a -- a litigation that involved the Department of Education, but it would be either litigation or arbitration of some sort, some form of adversarial proceeding, not policy in terms of how they recruit, how they get students, how they teach, where they teach, what they do -- really wasn't any of my expertise or involvement.

I might get involved in a lease negotiation or something like that, but pretty much I was doing defensive litigation of that type of -- of that nature.

The computer system, as I said, that they are talking about in this litigation I haven't a clue about, although I can't say that that is the same for my client. See, the problem here is that it doesn't matter who the lawyer is. institutional information of which they're afraid will be in the hands of the defendants' lawyer, is in the hands of the defendant, not the lawyer.

It doesn't matter who I am. Whatever I could possibly learn from my representation, I have a quarter of the knowledge, a tenth of the knowledge, that Mr. Simon has. was the school's president and general counsel. He was 25 | involved in every aspect of the school, up until he left a year

and several months ago. I think maybe it's about a year and a half ago. The manual in question I neither had any involvement 3 in its preparation or publication, nor was I even associated with the school for several years after it was drafted and published. I left in ninety nine. They're talking about a 2002 catalog. 7 8 Although my suspicion is, given how these kind of things are done, is that that catalog isn't radically different 9 than the catalog that preceded it, or the one that preceded it, 10 but nevertheless I had no involvement in that. The claim that information about Texas licensure was 12 passed from a Ross University employee to AUA is a recent event that occurred in the year 2004, almost seven years after I left 14 the university. And I had neither involvement in that document or the issue underlying it or, for that matter, licensure in 16 I wasn't really involved much in those issues. 17 THE COURT: How about -- were you involved at all in 18 developing policies for recruiting students or --19 MR. SCLAFANI: No. 20 21 THE COURT: -- the like? MR. SCLAFANI: I had no policy development roles. 22 And in any event, whatever involvement I -- I had really no 23 involvement with students at all, except as one might 24 occasionally sue. I had a litigation -- I only had a few of

those, one litigation out in Suffolk County in which a student claimed entitlement to a diploma even though he didn't meet certain criteria. There were claims that the university had changed its criteria.

And I think there were two litigations where the university had reacted to changes in the United States law and United States testing for admission into either clinical rotations in the United States or its various states, or ultimate licensure in the states, and the university changed its policies and criteria, and there were some students that complained that by and through those changes they were deprived of the right to diplomas.

They were ultimately asked to leave the school because they couldn't satisfy the criteria, and they sued and claimed they were entitled to diplomas or they were entitled to continue.

One had to do with this test -- there are two tests that you have to take, one before you can do clinical rotations

THE COURT: Okay. We don't need to --

MR. SCLAFANI: -- I did that kind of work.

Otherwise, I had no involvement whatsoever with the student body, with recruition -- with recruiting of students. I

24 | wouldn't know how they did it or why they did it or where they
25 | did it -- or of setting of policy --

```
THE COURT: Is -- is your client the owner of A. --
 1
   AUA?
 2
              MR. SCLAFANI:
                             Sorry, Judge?
 3
              THE COURT: Does your client own AUA, or --
 4
              MR. SCLAFANI: No, only --
 5
              THE COURT: -- have an ownership interest?
 6
              MR. SCLAFANI: -- only -- I'm not -- I'm not certain
 7
   whether he is -- I believe he is not the majority shareholder.
 8
   I believe he owns shares but he doesn't own the majority. But
   he does have control of the -- of a sort. I think it's more --
10
   I think he has more control than ownership. But I'm -- I can't
11
   tell you that for a fact.
12
13
             So -- and -- and I have to say that with respect to -
   - Your Honor was also very astute. When I came into this case,
14
   I spoke with my adversary at the end of the Weltman deposition,
15
   which -- in which it became patently clear that this
16
17
   university, AUA, had been solicited by Mr. Weltman, who wanted
   to do consulting work, and to install various types of
18
   accounting programs and the like.
19
20
             At no time did he say he was giving them Ross
   University's program, nor did he ever do that, nor did the
21
   university ever want it. But -- and the program that we're
22
23
   talking about is not even the program that Ross used.
   program -- that Ross is using. It's a program that Ross had
25
  used.
```

```
It was developed by another individual who Mr.
   Weltman worked for when he was in Ross University, and that
   individual had gotten from Ross University a document -- a --
   an agreement, one or two lines only, that allowed him to take
   it and use it.
 5
             And -- and he basically wrote and said look, you
   know, this is a product of my work, and I would have to
7
   recreate this, I can recreate this document, there was no
   copyright or not --
10
             THE COURT: I gather -- I gather the AUA's present
   position and your client's position is we're not using it in
11
   any event.
             MR. SCLAFANI: Well, we never did buy it. We never
13
   used it. We really never wanted it. He -- it wasn't even this
   -- he asked us for a bunch of different types of programs.
15
             He really wanted to be associated -- a lot of people
16
   at -- at Ross University -- a lot of the employees are unhappy
17
   with new management and know Mr. Simon quite well and have --
   on -- on a regular basis entreat them to become employees
19
   and/or to offer services of the like that they provided at
20
   Ross.
21
             And somehow -- and that's really what this lawsuit is
22
   about, is --
23
             THE COURT: Did the -- did the student who Ross fears
24
25 ∥ may have been poached or approached because of theft of some --
```

```
or misappropriation of some confidential information actually
   enroll at AUA, do you know?
 2
              MR. SCLAFANI: They -- they allege one student was
 3
   approached. He didn't enroll.
 4
              THE COURT: He did not?
 5
              MR. SCLAFANI: He did not. The one student that they
 6
   claim was approached -- my client will tell you, as we have
7
   told counsel, that AUA buys lists from all over the place.
   Matter of fact, because Mr. Simon was the general counsel and
   the president of the university, he knows exactly where to buy
10
   these lists from.
11
              There's millions of dollars that Ross University
12
   spends in obtaining these lists AUA seems to get for
13
   substantially cheaper amounts. There are any number of
14
   sources.
15
             Your Honor was also astute when you indicated that
16
17
   one student could have told another student, could have told
   the university my friend is interested in going. That is a
18
   common way that Ross University and AUA would solicit employees
19
   -- students, according to what my clients tell me.
20
             THE COURT: Well, let's -- let's switch gears for a
21
   second. And it's unfortunate that we don't have Pryor Cashman
22
   and the other firm here, but this sounds like a suit that ought
23
   to settle without a lot --
24
             MR. SCLAFANI: Well, I thought --
25
```

```
THE COURT: -- I mean, --
 1
 2
              MR. SCLAFANI: -- so too.
 3
              THE COURT: -- assuming that what you're telling me
   is correct, and assuming that -- I mean, it -- it -- it sounds
 4
   like the major motivating force here, as Mr. Mastaglio said, is
 5
   the notion that you might be poaching students or even rejects
   and therefore have access to that confidential information.
 7
 8
             And I gather from what you were telling me that the
   plaintiffs -- that -- that's the key to the plaintiffs' -- or
   that that's the reason we're here, as opposed to the student
10
11
   manual, for example.
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Obviously, the -- the concept that
12
   they may have been out there buying one of our computer
   programs was -- is elevated --
14
             THE COURT: Right.
15
16
             MR. MASTAGLIO: -- right to the top of my list.
   Whether -- whether the facts --
17
             THE COURT: But that -- but that --
18
             MR. MASTAGLIO: -- support that --
19
             THE COURT: -- may have gone by the boards with Mr.
20
21
   Weltman,
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Ah, --
22
             THE COURT: -- subject to --
23
24
             MR. MASTAGLIO: -- well, --
             THE COURT: -- some verification.
25
```

```
1
              MR. MASTAGLIO: -- there's -- there's no question in
   our mind, not in Mr. Sclafani's -- there's no question in our
 2
   mind that they were out there buying this -- this program.
 3
   They may have changed their mind.
 4
              This -- this two line letter that -- or e-mail to
 5
 6
   which he refers has nothing to do with ownership of -- of the
   computer program. But that would be for the court to decide.
7
              But that's a big time item, and -- and -- and the
8
   other one is as well. I put those at a -- at a level higher
9
   than the -- than the manual and higher than one or two of the
10
   other items, one of which was this Texas thing that --
11
             THE COURT: Well, presumably the -- the student,
12
   assuming he or she is in the U.S., can be deposed and I guess
13
14
   may not have great fondness for Ross University but probably
   has no reason not to explain exactly what happened here.
15
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Oh, we've interviewed her -- I
16
   haven't, but she's been interviewed, and -- and her affidavit -
17
   - the affidavit of the interviewer is -- was before the court
18
   on the --
19
20
             THE COURT:
                         Okay, and --
             MR. MASTAGLIO: -- on the motion.
21
             THE COURT: -- the substance of it is what?
22
             MR. MASTAGLIO: The substance of it is that she got a
23
   call and the person said I understand that you've been rejected
25 ∥ by Ross University, and, you know, come on and take a -- take a
```

```
11
 1 -- take a good look at us, something along those lines.
   don't -- I have the affidavit here, probably.
 3
              And our expectation is -- is that somehow they got
   that information. Now, --
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Well, I mean, from a practical viewpoint,
 6
   if -- if I allow you to make --
 7
             MR. MASTAGLIO: It -- excuse me. I'm sorry, Judge.
              THE COURT: Yeah.
 8
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Just -- I didn't mean to interrupt
9
   you. I apologize.
10
11
             THE COURT: No, that's fine.
             MR. MASTAGLIO: I should pull the affidavit out, Your
12
   Honor, because I think it's a little bit stronger. I don't
13
   think it opens up the possibility that you --
14
15
             THE COURT: Right.
             MR. MASTAGLIO: -- that you indicated, that some
16
   student -- other student may have -- may have told the AUA
17
   interviewer that -- that the -- that this person failed at
18
   Ross, so you ought to -- you ought to talk to them.
19
             THE COURT: But, --
20
             MR. MASTAGLIO: I don't think that's --
21
             THE COURT: -- I mean, one of the things your client
22
   wants, and perhaps the key thing your client wants, is
23
   injunctive relief, which Judge Berman was trying to help you
24
```

25 | bring about, or at least give you the opportunity to bring

```
12
```

```
about, through an expedited discovery schedule.
              But if I grant your application to submit a motion to
 2
   disqualify, until that gets resolved it seems like everything's
3
   going to be on ice, which is counterproductive to the goal you
4
   -- you presumably have.
5
              One suggestion I have is simply to bring everybody in
6
   and see whether we can resolve this case.
7
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Well, we're coming in on Monday, I
8
   believe.
9
             MR. SCLAFANI: No, I think it's Wednesday.
10
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Or Wednesday. It's now --
11
             THE COURT: Oh, is this the one -- did I ultimately
12
   set up a --
13
14
             MR. SCLAFANI: You -- you set --
             THE COURT: -- second date --
15
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- Wednesday at ten, --
16
             THE COURT: -- when I realized --
17
             MR. MASTAGLIO: That's right.
18
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- I believe.
19
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Wednesday. You're right.
20
             THE COURT: Okay.
21
             MR. SCLAFANI: But let me suggest, Judge, that --
22
             THE COURT: Yeah.
23
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- when I came into the case after
24
25 | Pryor Cashman's attempt to resolve the case, I met after the
```

```
13
```

Weltman deposition with counsel, and I said look, you now heard Mr. Weltman's deposition, you understand -- I looked at the 2 3 manual. I had copies of it. The manual really isn't the issue here. You have a 4 claim which my client will tell you is not what was transmitted 5 between the student -- that one student was solicited by AUA 7 that ultimately did not enroll -- we can resolve this case. This isn't a case --8 THE COURT: Do AUA -- do AUA's records -- well, 9 first, how big a school is AUA, student body? 10 MR. SCLAFANI: It's in its first year. I think it 11 has less than two hundred students, and I think at the time the 12 13 lawsuit was brought probably enrolled -- at one point, it had twelve students only a short while ago. 14 THE COURT: Did -- do its records show the source of 15 introduction to a particular --16 MR. SCLAFANI: Not necessarily. 17 THE COURT: -- candidate? 18 MR. SCLAFANI: Not necessarily, partly because they 19 don't have the kind of computer systems that would track those 20 things, because they didn't have the money or the resources to 21 buy any of those things or to set them up. It's those kind of 22 things that they're claiming that were stolen, but, in fact, 23 they don't exist. 24 THE COURT: Well, if they -- were they buying lead 25

sheets, or --MR. SCLAFANI: They were buying lists. They were 2 getting information from students. They were getting 3 information from former employees, all sorts of different sources, of who might be interested and where they might --5 they might look for students. 6 7 They were publishing. They had their own forms of advertisements, of -- of -- that the marketplace -- you -- you 8 -- you gotta understand, Judge, there are only a handful of 9 these not -- these for-profit medical schools. They're --10 THE COURT: Right. 11 MR. SCLAFANI: -- Caribbean medical schools. We call 12 them international medical schools. But the fact of the matter 13 is they're all in the Caribbean because the student body is 14 primarily American. 15 They -- they do their student work, their classroom 16 work, in -- in the -- the classrooms in the -- in the 17 Caribbean, and then they do clinical rotations in -- with the -18 - the universities, the foreign universities, the Caribbean 19 universities -- they get affiliation agreements with the 20 various hospitals all over the United States, and if they're 21 lucky enough to get clearance from the state education 22 23 departments, they can -- they can then have their students do training, clinical training, --24

25

THE COURT:

Right.

```
MR. SCLAFANI: -- in the United States.
 1
   students are primarily Americans. They -- they want to finish
   their clinical training and then apply for American licensure.
   They're not, by and large, foreigners. So the -- there are
   only a handful of these schools.
             Matter of fact, when Ross started there were three.
6
   One of them was -- was in -- in -- I don't think it was in
7
   Antiqua, but it was --
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Grenada.
9
             MR. SCLAFANI: No, there was Grenada, and Your Honor
10
   would remember the war in Grenada --
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Yeah.
12
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- to rescue the students.
13
             THE COURT: Right, I remember that.
14
             MR. SCLAFANI: It was the Grenada medical school.
15
16
   And one of them I -- I fondly call Crazy Eddie School of
   Medicine, because it was formed by Eddie Antar, who was the
17
   criminal that, --
18
             THE COURT: Right.
19
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- you know -- he actually formed that
20
21
   medical school, and it was a competitor of Ross University at
   the time. There are only a handful of these things. There are
22
   not a thousand of them.
23
             Everybody who is looking to go to medical school
24
  knows where they are. They know who they are. They know where
```

the students come from. They know who gets rejected. They -they -- the -- the biggest war between the universities is the 3 exchange of students. They raid each other's students on a regular basis. 4 They have solicitation. They have -- they have people that go 5 to the other universities --6 THE COURT: So somebody might do their first year at 7 Ross and their second year at --8 MR. SCLAFANI: Say it again? Oh, switching all the 9 time, on a regular basis, switching back and forth for one 10 reason or another. The good portion of Ross University 11 students are former -- a good portion of AUA students are 12 former Ross University students, which is one of the reasons 13 why this lawsuit exists, all right? 14 They can't claim actionable conduct, but nevertheless 15 the competition is fierce for those kind of students. And the 16 idea here is more than to shoot across the bow. The idea here 17 is to sink a -- a -- a startup university and involve it in a 18 major litigation. 19 20 I tried to settle it. I said look, you know, you got one student here, you know, we'll tell you what the source is 21 22 to the extent we know, --THE COURT: Well, that -- that --23 MR. SCLAFANI: -- what the catalog issue is, so that 24

25 | -- so that we'll calm any fears that you have that we have Deep

```
Throat deep inside your university. The -- the -- the Texas
    issue is an issue that you might wind up with Rule 11 sanctions
 2
 3
    on.
              The catalog issue might fall in the same category.
 4
    You -- this -- this -- you -- you might even find the same to
 5
   be true of this -- well, they might have some --
 6
              THE COURT: Well, focusing on the --
 7
              MR. SCLAFANI: -- so I said look, --
8
              THE COURT: Wait.
9
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Judge, --
10
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- I said let's --
11
              THE COURT: Focusing on the student for a moment,
12
   presumably even if the record keeping is not computerized, that
13
   student probably is either on a lead sheet, or is on a form
14
   that somebody sent in saying here are my friends who you might
15
   want to contact, or I suppose it could have been a conversation
16
   with, you know, somebody in recruiting and therefore not
17
   documented.
18
             But if there is a document that reflects where the
19
20
   student's name came from, --
             MR. SCLAFANI: I -- I don't know if there is or not.
21
   I -- I've asked them to search, partially because they're not
22
   computerized, to -- to see if they can trace back by documents
23
   all of the different solicitations and all the --
24
             THE COURT: Go back behind the table, because
25
```

otherwise -- you're -- you're only getting --

```
MR. SCLAFANI: I -- I keep doing that.
 2
              THE COURT: -- picked up to the extent my
 3
   microphone's picking you up.
 4
 5
              MR. SCLAFANI: I -- I've asked them to --
 6
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Mr. --
 7
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- I've asked them to check through
   their -- their records and see if they can compare students to
8
   -- to solicitations. They say it's virtually impossible. They
9
   really don't know where -- where they get these things from.
10
11
              They can't really match them up. They have some
          They have some lists. I said go through your lists and
12
   idea.
   see if any are on the list. They don't always save the lists.
13
14
   They go through them. They make the solicitations. They are
   not sophisticated.
15
             THE COURT:
                         What --
16
17
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Mr. --
             THE COURT: -- what schedule --
18
             MR. MASTAGLIO: -- Mr. --
19
             THE COURT: -- did Judge Berman set? You said he --
20
             MR. MASTAGLIO: He didn't. He just told us that --
21
   to go forward with the four depositions that we had. There was
22
23
   an agreement that the defendants could answer after the
   depositions were completed. It was hoped that they would be
24
25 | completed by the end of November. Obviously, this issue has
```

```
come in.
 1
              We did have a conference -- the general counsel of --
 2
   of DMI and I with Mr. Sclafani after the Weltman deposition.
 3
   We did say to him that we'd be happy to -- you know, once these
   three more depositions are over with, to take a hard look at
   the entire case, and if there's anything that -- you know, that
7
   can be resolved, we'd be happy to do it.
             We had an agreement to complete the remaining three
8
   depositions, and we wanted to find out what happened in these
9
10
   instances, and, you know, we wanted to talk to their recruiter,
   who was the person who had -- who had -- who had spoken to the
11
   rejected student, and, you know, we were more than willing to -
   - to sit down and talk, and -- but, you know, we've -- we want
13
   to find out what happened.
14
             THE COURT: Well, it's -- it sounds like the major
15
   player on AU's side is Mr. Simon, correct?
16
             MR. SCLAFANI: I -- I would say that he's --
17
             THE COURT: I mean, the decision maker.
18
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- one of the -- I mean, the
19
   depositions they want are all major players. My client -- I
20
   wasn't at that meeting, but I --
21
             THE COURT: No, I -- I'm -- I'm focusing on --
22
             MR. SCLAFANI:
                            Yeah.
23
             THE COURT: -- a different area in terms of --
24
             MR. SCLAFANI: Yeah.
25
```

```
20
 1
              THE COURT: -- resolving the suit.
 2
              MR. SCLAFANI: Right.
 3
              THE COURT: Mr. Simon, I take it, is the person on
   AU's side, is that --
 4
              MR. SCLAFANI: Probably not --
 5
 6
              THE COURT: -- notwithstanding the --
              MR. SCLAFANI: -- the most significant.
 7
              THE COURT: -- fact that -- oh, okay.
 8
              MR. SCLAFANI: Probably not the most significant.
 9
   Probably not the person that had the -- that was the acting
10
   party here.
11
              He was more -- in this context, his involvement has
12
   been more in terms of dealing with licensure issues.
13
14
              THE COURT: No, I -- I'm focusing on settlement.
             MR. SCLAFANI: On settlement? I would say him and --
15
   and his -- his partner, Harvey Marshak.
16
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Marshak. He's -- he's the fourth
17
   person we were going to depose, Harvey Marshak.
18
19
             THE COURT: And does Mr. Simon -- well, I guess he's
20
   probably down in Dominica, is that right?
21
             MR. SCLAFANI: No. Their -- their offices are here.
   The -- these --
22
23
             THE COURT: Oh, okay.
24
             MR. SCLAFANI: He goes down to Antigua.
25 | university is Antiqua.
```

```
THE COURT: Oh, okay. Right.
 1
 2
              MR. SCLAFANI: They go down there from time to time,
 3
    but -- but the -- the real work is done here, and that's also
 4
    true of Ross University. They're now in New Jersey.
 5
              MR. MASTAGLIO: That's right.
              THE COURT: That was going to be my next question.
 6
 7
    So there's somebody in Teaneck or someplace who --
 8
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Edison.
 9
              MR. SCLAFANI: They're all there.
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Edison, Your Honor. There surely is.
10
11
   There's the general counsel.
              MR. SCLAFANI: The teachers are down there, and the
12
   buildings, but the work goes on here.
13
              THE COURT: Does it make sense to have some of those
14
   honchos show up at the next conference?
15
16
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Sure. I mean, it's -- it's always of
   value to -- to have the Court try to mediate something. And
17
   obviously, the position that we had taken when we were talking
18
   to Mr. Sclafani and we were talking to the Pryor Cashman
19
   partner a couple weeks before that was let us find out what was
20
21
   going on, and then we'd be happy to sit down and -- and see if
   we could resolve this.
22
             Your Honor is suggesting that we meet with you --
23
24
             THE COURT: I mean, because as a practical matter, if
25 | I say fine, make your motion -- and that may be, you know,
```

```
where I end up, but it's going to take a little while for you
   to make your motion.
 2
              It's going to take a while for Mr. Sclafani to
 3
   respond, and meanwhile, by definition, nothing can go forward
 4
   by way of discovery, while --
 5
             MR. MASTAGLIO: The other -- the other alternative
6
7
   would be that we go forward with the depositions. We reserve
   our rights to make the motion, and -- so we're not prejudiced
8
   by having gone forward with the depositions with Mr. Sclafani
9
   as -- representing Mr. Simon, and then after the depositions of
10
11
             THE COURT: But that might prejudice Mr. Simon --
12
             MR. MASTAGLIO: That's possible, but --
13
             THE COURT: -- in that if you decide you want to go
14
   forward, he's handing off the case to somebody else -- Mr.
15
   Sclafani's handing off the case if you prevail to somebody who
16
   hasn't seen the first four deponents.
17
             MR. MASTAGLIO: I understood that.
18
19
             MR. SCLAFANI: It actually prejudices all of the
   clients, and -- and although I wasn't at that -- that
20
   conference in which counsel tells us an agreement was reached
21
   about these four depositions, I'm told by the Pryor Cashman
22
   firm that -- that Mr. Mastraglio is not accurately reporting
23
   the --
24
             MR. MASTAGLIO: I have a letter.
25
```

```
1
              MR. SCLAFANI: -- nature of the agreement.
 2
              MR. MASTAGLIO: I have a letter from them.
 3
              MR. SCLAFANI: All right. The -- the -- my
 4
    understanding is that --
              THE COURT: Wait. You lost me. Is not accurately
 5
   reporting what?
 6
 7
              MR. SCLAFANI: The nature of the agreement.
   that there was an agreement reached that he would get four
 8
   depositions, and everything else would -- that he would proceed
 9
   with those four depositions. My understanding from the Pryor
10
   Cashman firm was that they agreed to, quote, expedited
11
   discovery. We wouldn't have to answer.
12
13
              What happened after the Weltman deposition -- during
   the Weltman deposition, it became patently clear that they had
14
   information and documents that they hadn't shared with us, and
15
   it made it impossible for us to defend the depositions.
16
             THE COURT: Well, --
17
18
             MR. SCLAFANI: So --
             THE COURT: -- the case was referred to me for
19
   general pretrial, so for better or for worse, if I can't figure
20
   out what Judge Berman said -- well, I guess this was -- was
21
   this just an agreement, or this was Berman's directive? I take
22
   it --
23
             MR. MASTAGLIO: It was -- Your Honor, -- Your Honor,
24
25
```

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. SCLAFANI: It was an agreement made on a -- on --
as I understand it, an order to show cause seeking expedited
discovery was made and --
          THE COURT: And it was presented as a fait accompli
to Judge Berman?
          MR. SCLAFANI: -- and the parties entered into a -- a
-- an oral agreement with respect to that, and the Pryor
Cashman firm tells me that the agreement was that they would
engage in expedited discovery, not that they would be precluded
from their own discovery. They did agree to provide these
depositions.
          THE COURT: Well, I -- I -- I do have to say that --
I mean, if there's going to be at some point a -- a hearing on
injunctive relief, it can't very well go forward with one-sided
discovery.
          On the other hand, it may be that because of some of
the squirrelly issues in this case that maybe the plaintiff
goes forward with a series of depositions before the defendants
go forward with them.
          But since the case was referred to me for general
pretrial, in -- in -- in some respects it doesn't much matter
what Judge Berman had in his mind. The problem for all of you
now will be what I conclude makes sense.
```

MR. MASTAGLIO: Judge, if I can just address this,

that I'm misstating, you know, the -- the -- the concept of --

```
25
```

```
there was an agreement. There was a letter --
              THE COURT: Well, let -- let me suggest this.
 2
 3
    don't you send to me -- we have our conference Wednesday, you
    said?
 4
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Yes, we do.
 5
 6
              THE COURT: On Monday, send it to me overnight if you
 7
   could, a copy of the complaint, a copy of the affidavit --
   well, I guess it's a copy of whatever papers you were
 8
   submitting to Judge Berman which include the affidavit, and if
 9
   there's some letter agreement that deals with this, send me
10
    that also.
11
             MR. MASTAGLIO: I will. And you want our clients
12
   here for -- for Wednesday?
13
14
             THE COURT: Yeah, it seems to me -- and I guess that
   ought to be communicated to the two other lawyers as well.
15
             MR. SCLAFANI: Let me suggest this, Judge, so that we
16
17
   just -- because I really don't want to expend unnecessary legal
   fees on this rather fragile institution that now has two
18
   counsel. After my discussion with Mr. Mastraglio in which --
19
20
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Mastaglio.
             MR. SCLAFANI: I'm sorry?
21
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Mastaglio. I'm sorry.
22
23
             MR. SCLAFANI: I -- I'm --
             THE COURT: I was struggling with it also. Do it one
24
25 more time.
```

MR. MASTAGLIO: Mastaglio. 1 MR. SCLAFANI: Mastaglio. I'm sorry. 2 THE COURT: The G is silent. 3 MR. MASTAGLIO: The G is silent. 4 MR. SCLAFANI: You know what? You're the first 5 person that I know that has that that actually pronounces it 6 7 correctly. I have a client by the name of Battapaglia, and I say Battapalia [phonetic], and he says no, and it's Mastraglio. 8 MR. MASTAGLIO: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Well, it's particularly unforgivable for 10 Sclafani to be messing it up. 11 MR. SCLAFANI: Exactly. But in any event, after my 12 13 conversation, I spoke with Mr. -- in which I basically suggested that we would agree to full injunctive relief. 14 We wouldn't solicit any students, we wouldn't take 15 any of his lists, we wouldn't -- we -- we wouldn't -- we -- we 16 -- we'd stop using the catalog. We would -- I don't know what 17 you could do about the Texas thing, but, you know, we wouldn't 18 have further conversations with them, that -- you know, 19 suggested that we could resolve this case with injunctive 20 relief. 21 The fact of the matter is that there isn't a whole 22 23 lot in the way of money here unless we have some trumped up claims that -- we don't use their computer program. 24 25 | agree that we won't use it in the -- in the future if we ever

```
got our hands on it, which we don't have any intention of doing
   anyway.
 2
 3
              It's a program that didn't work for them.
   certainly isn't going to work for us. It's not the program
 5
   they currently use, at least as far as I understand it.
              The -- but when that failed, my client, Mr. Simon,
 6
 7
   who had a prior relationship because of dealings with Ross
   University and Devry itself, contacted Devry's president, who
   he knows, and said look, you know, let's see if we can't work
   this thing out, and he originally indicated a desire to do
10
11
   that, but he had to call back and say that he was advised by
   counsel not to have those discussions.
12
              So when my adversary tells you that he's anxious to
13
   have mediation and the like, what they're really anxious to do
14
   is draw up these legal fees. This is why this issue of my
15
16
   representation --
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Judge, --
17
             THE COURT: Well, what they --
18
             MR. SCLAFANI: -- is involved.
19
             THE COURT: -- what they're probably anxious to do is
20
   knock off four depositions before they decide what to do. But
21
22
             MR. MASTAGLIO: And we don't want the president or
23
   chairman of Devry talking to Neil Simon, who's a lawyer,
25 | without counsel being present.
```

```
THE COURT: Well, --
 1
 2
             MR. MASTAGLIO: And there's --
             THE COURT: -- I -- I still think -- why don't you
 3
   communicate --
 5
             MR. MASTAGLIO: That's not the way to settle the
 6
   case.
             THE COURT: -- to the two other lawyers involved, Mr.
 7
   Flauman [phonetic] -- who's the other?
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Pryor Cashman. Zuckerberg, Joshua
9
   Zuckerberg.
10
11
             THE COURT: Okay, that I want, you know, a decision
   maker for each side here on Wednesday. How much -- let me just
   make sure that I have enough time to --
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Judge, I don't think you need Mr.
14
   Weltman. May I make --
15
             THE COURT: No, Mr. Weltman doesn't sound like deep
16
   pocket here.
17
             MR. MASTAGLIO: No.
18
             THE COURT: Bear with me a second.
19
             MR. SCLAFANI: I think he's planning on being here.
20
   Oh, Mr. Weltman himself?
             MR. MASTAGLIO: Weltman himself.
22
             THE COURT: Yeah.
23
             MR. SCLAFANI: Unless you're going to drop --
24
             THE COURT: No, counsel should be here, but --
25
```

```
MR. SCLAFANI: Well, for settlement, I would think
 1
   that he would, if -- unless you're dropping your claim.
              THE COURT: Well, I would think Mr. Weltman will go
 3
   along with whatever everybody else thinks works. Yeah.
              MR. SCLAFANI: We -- we -- we indicated that -- that
5
   after the Weltman deposition, because we had no documents, and
6
   they were using documents that would have come in -- said these
7
   -- we can't even, you know -- these are third party
8
   depositions.
9
             They're -- that was a third party -- or a deposition
10
   of people other than our client, and even depositions of our
   client -- we really can't prepare for those depositions without
12
   certain exchange of information, at least the minimal
13
   information.
14
             So Pryor Cashman called and asked for Rule 26
15
   information, and my understanding from them is that there was a
16
   -- an agreement to provide that before the next deposition, and
17
   that was before this issue of my representation arose.
18
             THE COURT: Well, whatever --
19
             MR. SCLAFANI: But that information was never
20
21
   forthcoming.
             THE COURT: -- dates were scheduled were in November,
22
   so the dates that were scheduled have gone by the boards,
23
24
   correct?
             MR. MASTAGLIO: That's correct.
25
```

```
MR. SCLAFANI: Pretty much. So what I --
 1
              THE COURT: Okay, so we'll deal -- we'll deal with
 2
   all of that on Wednesday.
 3
              MR. SCLAFANI: Okay, fine.
 4
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Right. I haven't -- I have to
 5
   contact my client, obviously, and see as to her availability,
 6
   obviously. She'll --
 7
 8
              THE COURT: Right.
              MR. MASTAGLIO: -- she'll make herself available,
 9
   unless she's out of the country, I -- I would think.
10
             THE COURT: Okay.
11
             MR. MASTAGLIO: If there's a problem, I'll let you
12
   know.
13
             THE COURT: Please.
14
             MR. SCLAFANI: I don't -- the general counsel
15
   wouldn't be the person that makes the settlement decisions.
16
             THE COURT: Well, whoever it is, bring him, --
17
             MR. MASTAGLIO: I think that's for us to decide.
18
             THE COURT: -- him or her, or -- or both of them, if
19
   need be.
20
             MR. SCLAFANI: I think they need to bring the person
21
   that holds the purse strings, not the person that instigates
22
   the litigation.
23
             MR. MASTAGLIO: We're not paying money here, Your
24
25 | Honor. I don't -- I think the general counsel can decide on
```

```
injunctive relief.
 2
              THE COURT: Okay. I mean, if -- as long as it's not
 3
    somebody who says I need to go make a phone call to resolve
 4
    this.
              MR. MASTAGLIO: Well, I mean, I -- I can't say where
 5
    the -- she would be the most important person --
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Well, find out, and if it --
 8
              MR. MASTAGLIO: -- at -- at Ross University.
              THE COURT: -- if it -- if it means bringing two
 9
10
   people, bring two people.
              MR. MASTAGLIO: No, but what I'm saying is she's --
11
   she's the -- the -- the main person at Ross University and --
12
   and DMI. Whether somebody at Devry, for example, in Chicago
13
   would -- would have to somehow be involved in -- she would make
14
   a recommendation. That's a different story. I'm not -- I'm
16
   not --
             THE COURT: Okay. Well, there's always sort of a
17
   judgment call. I mean, if it's a public company, typically,
18
   you know, in major litigation the board of directors has to get
19
   involved, but --
20
21
             MR. MASTAGLIO: That's right.
             THE COURT: -- there's usually general counsel or
22
   somebody who can provide a good indication as to what's
23
24
   acceptable or not.
25
             MR. MASTAGLIO: She can do that.
```

